

1 THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR
2
3
4
5
6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

CASE NO. CR21-0045-JCC

11 v. Plaintiff,

ORDER

12 SUMIT GARG,

13 Defendant.

14
15 This matter comes before the Court on Defendant's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No.
16 844) of this Court's order denying Defendant's request to dismiss his case on constitutional
17 grounds (Dkt. No. 752). Having thoroughly considered the relevant record, the Court hereby
18 DENIES Defendant's motion for the reasons explained herein.

19 Under the Local Criminal Rules, “[m]otions for reconsideration are disfavored.”
20 CrR12(b)(13)(A). “The Court will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of
21 manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not
22 have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence.” *Id.* “A motion for
23 reconsideration should not be used to ask the court to rethink what the court had already thought
24 through—rightly or wrongly.” *Ma v. Univ. of S. California*, 2019 WL 1239269, slip op. at 1
25 (W.D. Wash. 2019).

Here, Defendant asks the Court to reconsider its ruling denying his motion to dismiss his case. (Dkt. No. 844.) In that motion, Defendant asserted sweeping constitutional claims for which he sought the dismissal of the charges against him. (*See* Dkt. No. 652.) Defendant fails to demonstrate manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority, as required by LCR 7(h)(1). Instead, Defendant merely reiterates previously considered arguments that the Court rejected. (*Compare* Dkt. No. 652 at 2–6, *with* Dkt. Nos. 776, 844 at 3–8.)

Accordingly, Defendant's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 844) is DENIED.

DATED this 11th day of March 2024.

Joh C Coyle

John C. Coughenour
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE